

forth in the Appeal Brief filed February 15, 2002. However, since the Examiner has responded to the arguments set forth in the Appeal Brief, Applicants set forth the following additional points distinguishing the claimed invention from that of the references relied upon in the rejection.

In particular, the pending independent claims include a step of transmitting trading processing information to the client which includes the present status of processing for processing initiated for an order, a present status of processing for delivery of a product corresponding to the order and a present status of processing for payment for the trading. As set forth in the May 20, 2002 Office Action (page 31, lines 5-7) Talati is relied upon for disclosing trading processing information that includes the present status of processing for delivery of the product or order, referring to col. 1, lines 55-67; col. 6, lines 25-43; col. 11, lines 60-67, and col. 12, lines 1-19 of the reference.

Applicants takes the position that Talati merely discloses transaction processing and authentication that is decided at the time of ordering a product, not afterward when present status information would be exchanged. In this respect, in Talati, there is an exchange of information between an originator 50 and a recipient 55 using an e-mail delivery system 305 (col. 11, lines 37-40 of Talati). The

"delivery" referred to is the e-mail delivery system that is set forth by Talati with respect to the exchange of the information between the originator and recipient. On the other hand, Applicants' claimed invention includes transmitting or managing present status of processing for delivery of a product corresponding to an order, which necessarily occurs after the order processing.

The Examiner refers to Talati's e-mail system and further cites the disclosure by Talati that the e-mail delivery system provides a traceable delivery system. Further, as noted by the Examiner, Talati states that the e-mail delivery system may also be used to process complex transactions and safely share information between multiple entities (citing col. 8, lines 21-25 of the reference). From this cited passage of Talati, the Examiner concludes that the reference discloses the processing of the present status of the delivery of the product corresponding to an order (see page 33, lines 17-20 of the May 20, 2002 Office Action). This conclusion is not supported by the reference, however.

Rather, one having ordinary skill in the art would view the disclosure of Talati as being silent in its disclosure with respect to disclosing the receiving or managing of present status of processing for processing initiated for an order including the present status of processing for delivery

of the product corresponding to the order and present status of processing for payment for the trading. Therefore, at issue is whether one having ordinary skill in the art would find the differences between the invention as claimed and Talati obvious at the time of the invention.

With respect to the delivery system disclosed by Talati, the Examiner refers to the Description of Related Art section of the patent that refers to Fig. 1. The commercial transaction flow chart shown in the figure merely sets forth the entities of a client 10, merchant 20 and payment authority 30. The delivery system is disclosed as having some tracking capability. However, Fig. 1 is not a figure of the invention disclosed by Talati, but rather a description of the background art related to the invention. Therefore, there is no correspondence between the "delivery" described with respect to Fig. 1 (referring to col. 1, lines 56-65 of the reference) by Talati and the description provided in col. 8, lines 21-25 of the reference which the Examiner cites as describing the claimed present status of processing for delivery of the product. Accordingly, Applicants maintain their position that Talati fails to describe the claimed receiving or managing of information including a present status of processing for delivery of a product corresponding to an order.

Further, the present status of processing for payment processing for the trading is not disclosed by Talati. Rather, the e-mail message transmitted by the e-mail delivery system includes content 348 (Fig. 12) necessary to perform validation and authorization procedures at the credit authorities or transaction administrator and the transaction originating party. See col. 11, lines 29-37 of the reference. Thus, this information is not related to the present status of payment processing, but rather to authorization and validation with respect to the transaction being requested.


Talati is also silent with respect to the comparing of a trading identifier and an e-mail address included in the trading information and outputting a warning if they are not coincident, as recognized by the Examiner. In this regard, the Examiner relies upon Wiecha for disclosing that a purchaser can update the status of a PO manually after receiving acknowledgements, status, updates, etc. from vendors via fax, phone or mail. However, Wiecha does not disclose the status of the delivery of the product as in the present invention, which is received from the communication network through which the order for the product is transmitted. Therefore, the teaching and disclosure provided by Wiecha is limited with respect to suggesting the proposed modifications

to Talati set forth by the Examiner to one having ordinary skill in the art.

Despite the limited teaching provided by Wiecha, the Examiner states that the combination of Talati and Wiecha provides the functionality of receiving the status of the delivery of the product in the present invention (see page 33, line 20 - page 34, line 2 of the Office Action). However, this reason does not provide a proper motivation for combining the Talati and Wiecha references to suggest the modification to Talati required in the rejection. Therefore, the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection of the claims based on Talati and Wiecha should be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, reconsideration and reexamination are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

  
John R. Mattingly  
Registration No. 30,293  
Attorney for Applicants

MATTINGLY, STANGER & MALUR  
1800 Diagonal Road, Suite 370  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314  
(703) 684-1120  
Date: August 20, 2002